EU CAP NETWORK

Thematic Group on
CAP Strategic Plans: Monitoring Committees
1st TG meeting
25/09/2023

Group 1- 1st round

Exploring experiences of Monitoring Committees and highlight examples of good practice.

Relevant experiences

BE-Fl - MC is a political body. But MC provides important experiences / perspectives from other stakeholders, **improves understanding**

DK - MC is not a political body. Those decisions are taken outside this forum

IT - challenge in regional countries.

Want to share experiences in the governance between national/regional

Amendments - BE-Fl - took the advice from MC to negotiations in Bxls & will feed back any changes required. Is this a good way of doing things? Is this what others do?

Balanced representation - critical precondition for effective operation of MCs. Environmental NGOs under-represented?

Amendments - same in DE - parallel discussions with Bxls and with MC. Can be **challenging - content and timing**

Tensions with getting right balance of representation - covering full range of stakeholders

e.g. 3rd sector -where have less capacity to engage in countries where sector less developed

Experience from IT - high levels of applications from an open call - difficult to choose members. Now ask for representatives from organisations. But this is felt to lead to imbalanced representation (envt voice weak)

Transparency - requires written procedures, clarity on how MC is set up.

Physical meetings crucial - lots of new faces - to get to know each other

Risk of shadow cttees being a continuation of RDP MCs - need to ensure new voices & stakeholders come on board to cover all objectives

Transparency of how MC advice is used

How to maintain engagement over time?

Question: How are MCs Inputting to intervention eligibility criteria?

Question: MC consultation statements - how are these being addressed by MSs?

In EL - all these questions are put to the MC and all comments are uploaded to the electronic platform so completely transparent.

Examples

Engagement
Good practice - MCs are asked in advance to come with proposals for changes required to address problems

EE - had a **shadow MC** while CSP was developed. Same members now in formal MC. Good overlap from last period.
Also open call for new members to cover new interventions.

DE - **open call** for members - certain number of seats for different kinds of stakeholders - leads to more **balanced representation**

Technical Working Groups - to have technical discussions on what changes required, before the political debate.

DK - built on previous experience with MC but extended to new members

DE - considered important to open out membership via open call. Required enough time to review etc

NL **- knowledge exchange** between MC and parallel working groups to ensure MC advice is taken on board.

PL - changed composition of MC to include researchers over time. Still not enough representation from NGOs. Majority are representatives from the administration - means they carry the vote.

NL - provide information / technical briefings to MC members in advance of the MC to bring all to **same baseline level of knowledge**

Excursions - good way of getting to know each other and seeing CSPS operating in practice - greater possibility to speak freely